



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,162	10/03/2003	Jung-Yi Tsai	252011-1720	3946

24504 7590 10/06/2004

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER

BAHTA, KIDEST

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2125

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/679,162	Applicant(s) TSAI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kidest Bahta	Art Unit 2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi et al. (U. S. Patent 6,618,692) in view of Hu et al. (U. S. Patent 6,314,379).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26-27 and 32, Takahashi discloses a quality assurance for use between a service provider and a control center (Fig. 18), comprising the steps of: transferring of engineering data corresponding to the process to the control center via Internet (column 18, lines 51-65), and holding of the goods at the first process stage by the service provider (column 11, lines 38-59; Fig. 20, i.e., Fig. 12 and Fig. 20); comparison of the engineering data with a standard specification for confirming quality of the goods by the control center (column 20, lines 39-50; Fig. 17); transferring of a confirmation message to the service provider via the Internet by the control center if the engineering data conforms to the standard specification (column 21, lines 4-26); and release of the goods for further operations by the service provider after the confirmation message is received (column 21, lines 20; Fig. 12 and Fig. 20, Fig. 21);

Takahashi fails to disclose performing of a process on goods at a first process stage by the service provider and the test processes are circuit probe tests.

Hu discloses performing of a process on goods at a first process stage by the service provider (Fig. 3) and the test processes are circuit probe tests (Fig. 2, element 115).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teachings of Takahashi with the teachings of Hu in order to provided a remote diagnostic system and a remote diagnostic method which enables the user to carry out with high reliability diagnostic using highly analytical data and further eases the economical burden on the developer of the diagnostic software.

Regarding claims 2, 7, 12, 17, 22 and 28, Takahashi discloses transferring of a fail message to the service provider by the control center if the engineering data does not conform to the standard specification (Fig. 8; Fig. 19)

Regarding claims 3, 8, 13, 18, 23 and 29, Takahashi discloses performing of a recovery measure on the goods by the service provider if the fail message is received (column 15, line 65 – column 16, lines 20).

Regarding claims 4, 9, 14, 19, 24 and 30, Takahashi discloses the engineering data comprises identity of the goods, stage name of the first process stage, and process information of the process at the first process stage (column 15, lines 9-33; Fig. 7).

Regarding claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 31, Takahashi discloses the process information comprises a recipe used in the first process stage (column 15, lines 19-20).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the independent claims Applicant argues that Takahashi fails to disclose that the holding of the goods at the first process stage by the service provider and the release of the goods for further operations by the service provider after the confirmation message is received.

However Examiner disagrees since Takahashi discloses that the holding of the goods at the first process stage by the service provider and the release of the goods for further operations by the service provider after the confirmation message is received (Fig. 12, Fig. 20, and Fig. 21; i.e., start troubleshooting... confirm 1140 and 1144 ... end troubleshooting).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5. Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kidest Bahta, whose telephone number is (703) 308-6103. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. If

Art Unit: 2125

attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached (703) 308-0538. Additionally, the fax phone for Art Unit 2125 is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Kidest Bahta

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kidest Bahta', with a stylized, flowing script.

September 29, 2004